



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,024	06/11/2001	Philip S. Coulthard	CA920010014US1/2182P	3395
7590 Sawyer Law Group LLP P.O. Box 51418 Palo Alto, CA 94303			EXAMINER STORK, KYLE R	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/879,024
Filing Date: June 11, 2001
Appellant(s): COULTHARD ET AL.

Kelvin M. Vivian
Reg. No. 53,727
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 30 March 2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 27 June 2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2002/0120787	Shapiro et al.	8-2002
2004/0015839	Sarkar et al.	6-2004

6721713

Guheen et al.

4-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro et al. (US 2002/0120787, filed 28 February 2001, hereafter Shapiro) and further in view of Sarkar et al. (US 2004/0015839, filed 9 April 2001, hereafter Sarkar).

As per independent claim 1, Shapiro discloses a method for converting display source code of a legacy application having mixed business and presentation logic on a server to a network interactive web-browser page, the method comprising:

- Resolving the display source code of the legacy application into a plurality of record formats (paragraphs 0090-0091) each record format corresponding to source code associated with an input/output screen of a legacy application (paragraphs 0090-0091; 0109; 0130-0135: Here, XML files are stored in the database. These XML files reference functions and data of the legacy application; paragraphs 0063-0064 and 0090: Here, a requested document, an

HTML document, is displayed in a web browser. Further, the requested document is analyzed, and based upon the analysis, information is created)

- Parsing each record format into a corresponding intermediate file that is renderable by a web browser (paragraph 0063; paragraphs 0121 and 0130-0135)

Shapiro fails to specifically disclose each intermediate file including:

- The static content corresponding to an unchanging portion of a given input/output screen of the legacy application
- The dynamic content corresponding to a dynamic portion of the given input/output screen that is filled in at runtime by the legacy application

However, Sarkar discloses each intermediate file including:

- The dynamic content corresponding to a dynamic portion of the given input/output screen that is filled in at runtime by the legacy application (paragraph 0011)
- The static content corresponding to an unchanging portion of a given input/output screen of the legacy application (paragraphs 0010 and 0040: Here, static variables define static components of a JavaServer Page)

Shapiro further fails to disclose converting the static content of each intermediate file to a corresponding web page for display on the web browser including creating dynamic components for populating the web page based on the dynamic content of the intermediate file. However, Sarkar discloses converting the static content of each intermediate file to a corresponding web page for display on the web browser including

creating dynamic components for populating the web page based on the dynamic content of the intermediate file (paragraphs 0010-0011 and 0040).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 2, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each web page is displayed on the internet (paragraphs 0062).

As per dependent claim 3, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each web page is displayed on a network selected from the group consisting of: an internal network, an Intranet, a LAN, a WAN, an internal bus, a wireless network (paragraphs 0062-0063).

As per dependent claim 4, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each intermediate file is an XML language file (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 5, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses use of an HTML file (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 6, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro fails to

specifically disclose use of a WML file. However, WML was well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as being an XML protocol for specifying markup for WAP devices. While Shapiro does not specifically disclose WML, Shapiro does disclose use of wireless connections (paragraph 0063) and XML (paragraph 0061). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined WML with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user of a WAP enabled device to obtain legacy data.

As per dependent claim 7, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein each web page further comprises a JavaServer Page (paragraph 0010). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 8, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein the dynamic components further comprise JavaBeans (paragraph 0010-0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Sarkar with Shapiro, since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

As per dependent claim 9, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses wherein each web page is stored on the server (paragraphs 0067-0071).

As per independent claims 10-13, the applicant recites the limitations that are substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 10-13 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 14, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro further discloses performing steps of the method at development time during which a user is preparing a new user interface for the legacy application (paragraph 0086: Here, the data mining system determines functions calls that can be made to a legacy application and stores them in a repository prior to a user issuing a function call).

As per dependent claim 16, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Sarkar further discloses wherein parsing the display file data description source and converting each intermediate file are each executed during development time of the web-browser page and the dynamically updating the at least one web page and displaying the dynamically updated web page are each executed during runtime (paragraphs 0010-0011). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined since it would have allowed a user to define common interfaces for export of properties, attributes, events, and methods (Sarkar: paragraph 0007).

Claim 15 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shapiro and Sarkar, and further in view of Guheen et al. (US 6721713, filed 27 May 1999, hereafter Guheen).

As per dependent claim 15, Shapiro and Sarkar disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Shapiro fails to specifically disclose performing operations offline without a remote connection to the server upon which the application resides. However, Guheen discloses performing methods offline (column 210, lines 14-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Guheen with Shapiro and Sarkar, since it would have allowed a user to minimize data requests while pages were being generated.

(10) Response to Argument

The appellant's initial argument is based upon the belief that Shapiro fails to disclose resolving display source code of a legacy application into a plurality of record formats, in which each record format corresponds to source code with an input/output screen of the legacy application (pages 7-8). The appellant is correct in asserting that Shapiro discloses analyzing the legacy system in order to determine callable functions (page 8). However, the appellant's assertion that Shapiro fails to teach resolving display source code into a plurality of records and each record format corresponding to source code with an input/output screen is incorrect. Shapiro discloses that the data mining computer system may store the mined information in a repository (paragraph

0091). Shapiro discloses the repository being one of a file system or database (paragraph 0091), either repository format satisfying the appellant's claimed record formats. Further, Shapiro discloses the inclusion of input/output data stored within record formats of the repository (Figure 12; paragraphs 0135-0138).

The appellant's second argument is based upon the belief that neither Sarkar nor Guheen alleviate the believed deficiencies of Shapiro (page 9). However, the examiner believes Shapiro discloses the limitations above, and therefore Sarkar and Guheen are not relied upon to disclose the limitation.

The appellant's third argument is based upon the belief that the claimed limitation is not disclosed by the prior art of record (page 9). Again, the examiner believes Shapiro discloses the limitation, and therefore disagrees with this argument for the reasons above.

As per claims 2-15, the appellant relies upon the argument put forth with respect to claim 1 (page 10). The examiner again believes Shapiro discloses the limitation in question. Therefore, this argument is similarly not persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Application/Control Number:
09/879,024
Art Unit: 2176

Page 10

Respectfully submitted,

Kyle Stork

Conferees:

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Doug Hutton, SPE 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100